#### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIO	NAL SEARCHING A	UTHORITY		MANG
То:	THE SECTION OF THE SE			PCT PCT PCT
				RITTEN OPINION OF THE IONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY
				(PCT Rule 43bis.1)
· · · · ·			Date of mailing (day/month/year)	See form PCT/ISA/210
	gent's file reference		FOR FURTHER	ACTION
·	138 Maisch/	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		See paragraph 2 below
International ap	oplication No. 2004/002399 	International filing date (28.10.2004	(day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 20.12.2003
		) or both national classification and ./03, G01N21/05	id IPC	
Applicant	POGGII CAMI			
ROBERT	BOSCH GMBH			
-				
l. This o	opinion contains indicat	ions relating to the following item	s:	
$\boxtimes$	Box No. I Bas	is of the opinion		
$\boxtimes$	Box No. II Pric	ority		
$\boxtimes$	Box No. III No.	n-establishment of opinion with re	gard to novelty, invent	ive step and industrial applicability
		k of unity of invention	C ,	
	Box No. V Rea	•	_	novelty, inventive step or industrial tement
	Box No. VI Cer	tain documents cited		
	Box No. VII Cer	tain defects in the international ap	plication	
	Box No. VIII Cer	tain observations on the internatio	nal application	
2. FUR'	THER ACTION			
Interr than t	national Preliminary Exa his one to be the IPEA	amining Authority ("IPEA") excep	ot that this does not app I the International Bur	ll be considered to be a written opinion of the ply where the applicant chooses an Authority other eau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of
writte	en reply together, wh <del>er</del>	d above, considered to be a writte e appropriate, with amendments, expiration of 22 months from the pr	before the expiration	A, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA at of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form expires later.
For fi	irther options, see Form	PCT/ISA/220.		•
3. For fi	rther details, see notes	to Form PCT/ISA/220.		
Name and	ing address of the ICAG		And to 1 co	
wame and mail	ing address of the ISA/I	Sr .	Authorized officer	
ym , , , ,				
Facsimile No.			Telephone No.	

Box	No. I	Basis of this opinion
1.	With filed.	regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was unless otherwise indicated under this item.
		This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language . which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under
		Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2.	With inver	regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed attion, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	a.	type of material
		a sequence listing
		table(s) related to the sequence listing
	b.	format of material
		in written format
		in computer readable form
	c.	time of filing/furnishing
		contained in the international application as filed.
		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3.		In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4.	Addi	tional comments:

Bo	x No.	II Priority
1.	$\boxtimes$	The following document has not yet been furnished:
		copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).
		translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).
		Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established or the assumption that the relevant date in the claimed priority date.
2.		This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3.	Ado	ditional observations, if necessary:
		- -
: :		

Box No. II	II Non-establishment of opinion	on with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial app	licability	
The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:				
	the entire international application			
	claims Nos. 2-6			
becaus	se:			
	the said international application, or t	he said claims Nos.		
	relate to the following subject matter	which does not require an international preliminary examination	on (specify):	
		•		
	the description, claims or drawings (in are so unclear that no meaningful opin	ndicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. 2,3 nion could be formed (specify):		
	See supplemental	sheet		
		-		
"	the claims, or said claims Nos.  by the description that no meaningful	opinion could be formed.	are so inadequately supported	
	no international search report has bee	n established for said claims Nos.		
	the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequential sequences in that:	uence listing does not comply with the standard provided for i	in Annex C of the Administrative	
	the written form	has not been furnished		
		does not comply with the standard		
	the computer readable form	has not been furnished		
		does not comply with the standard		
	the tables related to the nucleotide a	nd/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable fo	rm only, do not comply with the	
		n Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.	• •	
	See Supplemental Box for further det	ails.		

Box	No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	
1.	Statemen	nt	
	Nove	lty (N) Claims 10, 11	YES
		Claims 1, 7-9, 12-14	_ NO
	Inven	tive step (IS)  Claims	YES
		Claims 1, 7-14	_ NO
	Indus	trial applicability (IA) $Claims$ 1, 7-14	YES
		Claims	- NO
2.		and explanations:	
		his opinion, the following search report citations	
		mentioned; the same numbering will be used throughout	
ı		procedure:	
	D1:	DE 195 12 126 C1 (HEKATRON GMBH, 79295 SULZBURG, DE)	
		5 September 1996 (1996-09-05)	
	D2:	US-B1-6 469 303 (SUN HONG <i>ET AL</i> .) 22 October 2002	
		(2002-10-22)	
	D3:	US-A-6 067 840 (CHELVAYOHAN <i>ET AL</i> .) 30 May 2000	
		(2000-05-30)	
	D4:	PATENT ABSTRACTS OF JAPAN vol. 2000, no. 01, 31	
		January 2000 (2000-01-31) & JP 11 271221 A (HORIBA	
		LTD), 5 October 1999 (1999-10-05)	
	D5:	DE 202 03 759 U1 (STEINEL GMBH & CO. KGAA) 18 July	
		2002 (2002-07-18) 10 April 2003 (2003-04-10)	
	D6:	DE 203 01 081 U1 (DRAEGER SAFETY AG & CO. KGAA)	
	D7:	US 2002/104967 A1 (KOUZNETSOV ANDRIAN) 8 August 2002	
		(2002-08-08)	
	D8:	PATENT ABSTRACTS OF JAPAN vol. 1997, no. 11, 28	
		November 1997 (1997-11-28) & JP 09 184803 A (HORIBA	
	•	LTD), 15 July 1997 (1997-07-15)	
	D9:	GB-A-2 262 338 (STEPHEN WILLIAM GOOM) 16 June 1993	
		(1993-06-16)	
	D10:	EP-A-0 825 430 (EEV LIMITED) 25 February 1998 (1998-	

International application No. PCT/DE2004/002399

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

02 - 25)

- D11: DE 196 45 321 A1 (WIEGLEB, GERHARD, PROF. DR., 58849 HERRSCHEID, DE) 7 May 1998 (1998-05-07)
- D12: WO 2004/010116 A (SENSEAIR AB; MARTIN, HANS, GOERAN, EVALD) 29 January 2004 (2004-01-29)
- D13: US 2004/188622 A1 (YOKURA HISANORI *ET AL.*) 30 September 2004

#### 2 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

- 2.1 The present application does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(1) because the subject matter of claim 1 is not novel within the meaning of PCT Article 33(2).
- Document D1 discloses (the references between 2.2 parentheses relate to said document): gas sensor (see figure 6) for measuring at least one gas concentration, having a substrate (4), an IR radiation source (5) mounted on the substrate; an IR detector (7) mounted on the substrate, a measurement space (2) for receiving a gas with the gas concentration to be measured, a shielding device (25), arranged in the measurement space between the IR radiation source and the IR detector, for shielding a direct transmission of IR radiation from the IR radiation source to the IR detector along an optical axis, and a reflection surface comprising a concavely curved first mirror region (10) for receiving the IR radiation emitted by the IR radiation source and a concavely curved second mirror region (12) reflecting the IR radiation towards the IR detector,

International application No.
PCT/DE2004/002399

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

in which the measurement space is formed between the reflection surface and the substrate.

2.3 Document D12 (WO2004/010116) also discloses a gas sensor having the features of claim 1, as long as one of sides 30a or 30c of the chamber (20) is regarded as the substrate (see figure 12), and 3h or 60a (see figure 12 and page 21, lines 20-22) is regarded as the shielding device. The measurement space is then formed between the side 30a or 30b and the concave reflection surface 30b.

#### 3 DEPENDENT CLAIMS 7-14

3.1 Claims 7-14 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the PCT requirements for novelty and inventive step, see documents D1 (see figure 6, column 9, lines 33-48) and D4 (see figure 1), the relevant text references cited in the search report.

International application No.
PCT/DE2004/002399

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of:

#### Box III

#### CLAIMS 2-6

- 1.1 The application does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 6 because claim 2 is unclear.
- 1.2 It is not clear what form the two mirror regions have because the word "spherical" suggests a three-dimensional form and "cross section" a two-dimensional form.
- 1.3 Since claims 3-6 are dependent on claim 2 they are not clear either.
- 1.4 Furthermore, claim 3 is not clear by itself because a semicircular area cannot be concave. It is obvious that an attempt is made here to describe that the area is of semicylindrical design (see description, page 5, line 18). In addition, a semi cylindrical area has a semicircular cross section.